

Page 6 10/808,913 Brusilovsky 6-7-2 LUC480

**Remarks**

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-3, 8-14 and 16-20 are pending.

Applicant's arguments presented below focus on certain patentable differences between the invention as claimed and the applied references. However, it is not to be inferred that the failure to argue all differences between the claimed subject matter and the applied references constitutes acceptance of assertions made in the Office Action of alleged similarities between elements of the claimed subject matter and the applied references.

**Claim Objections:**

The dependence of claim 18 is corrected so that it depends from claim 1. Claim 15 is canceled per the notice in the Office Action. With these corrections, it is believed the claim objections have been overcome.

**Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §103:**

Claims 1-3 and 8-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Michael (U.S. 2004/0170263) in view of Sun (US 2005/0190744), Lamb (US 6,747,970) and Tang (the "ConNexus to Awarenex: Extending awareness to mobile users" provided by Applicant).

**Re Claim 3:**

Claim 3, which depends on claim 2, further recites that the determining of the presence state of the PSTN subscriber comprises comparing a current call state associated with the one telephone line with the stored previous call state associated with the at least one telephone line. In the Office Action only the Tang reference is relied upon as teaching this limitation. It is respectfully submitted that Tang does not teach the subject limitation.

Page 7 10/808,913 Brusilovsky 6-7-2 LUC480


It is stated in the Office Action, "In figure 7, the office is recommended as the likely location of the user. This is determined by comparing the active state of the equipment there to the idle state of all other equipment associated with that particular user." In Tang, right-hand column of the page on which figure 7 appears, second complete paragraph, it is stated: "In the example in Figure 7, Bo was most recently active in his home office and has devices in two other locales (mobile and home) through which he can be contacted." The word "office" is shown in bold in figure 7. "The most likely locale to reach the user (i.e., the locale with the most recent activity) is indicated by the locale label in bold." However, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the office of the choices office, mobile and home as indicated in figure 7 was selected because the user's computer was determined to be "active"; see figure 7. It is also shown in figure 7 that with regard to the office category the office phone has been idle for more than 4 hours, with regard to the mobile category the cell phone has been idle for less than one hour, and for the home category the phone has been idle for more than 7 hours.

Therefore, it cannot be said that Tang teaches comparing the current call state associated with one telephone line with the stored previous call state associated with at least one telephone line. That is, if Tang taught this limitation, it would be the mobile category that would have been selected and highlighted in bold since the phone associated with the mobile category has been idle for the shortest time relative to the other phones. One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the active status of the user's computer controlled the selection of the office locale, and not a comparison of call states among telephone lines. Since Tang does not support the teaching of the limitation of claim 3, and none of the other references are relied upon as supplying such a teaching, it is respectfully submitted that the 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 3 is not supported. Withdrawal of the 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 3 is requested to be withdrawn.

Page 8 10/808,913 Brusilovsky 6-7-2 LUC480

If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Charles L. Warren", is written over a horizontal line.

Charles L. Warren  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27,407

Dated: March 4, 2010  
CARMEN PATTI LAW GROUP, LLC  
Customer Number 47382